## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/773,333	OKUMURA, HIROSHI		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JOHANNES MONDT	3663		

	JOHANNES WONDT	3003	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>26 May 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1	r).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> </ol>			cause
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
<ul><li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beti</li><li> appeal; and/or</li></ul>			ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c		ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1)	16 and 41.33(a)).		
4. $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
<ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li></ol>			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>			_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) rejected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>14,16 and 29-36</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13.			
	/JOHANNES MONDT/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3663	
	= · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Amendment to the specification only overcomes an objection, which is a petitionable matter, and hence does not place the application in better condition for appeal.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument traversing the interpretation of LDD regions as channel regions does not persuade in the opinion of examiner, because (1) the LDD regions inherently and necessarily must be crossed for charge carriers (electrons or holes) to travel between source and drain and hence are part of the channel, while (2): even arguendo, the amount of doping of the LDD regions of the prior art, which approximately determines the local conductivity, is far closer to that of the central channel region than it is to the conductivity of the source/drain regions (in magnitude said conductivities stand in the ratio of channel: LDD: source/drain = 1: 20:2,500). Applicant's arguments on channel doping type are not reflected in the current claim language. Applicant's reference to nomenclature (of what is called channel by the prior art) appears not persuasive, because the only essential physical quantities are the relative position (along the pathway from source to drain) and the relative electric conductivity as determined mainly by doping.